

**DOCKET NO.: TIC-0081**  
**Application No.: 10/519,753**  
**Office Action Dated: August 21, 2006**

**PATENT**

**Amendments to the Drawings**

The attached replacement sheets 1, 2, 3, 4, 5A, 5B, 6, 7 replaces the original FIGs. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5A, 5B, 6, 7. FIG. 6 has been amended.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets 1, 2, 3, 4, 5A, 5B, 6, 7.

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-9 are pending. No claims have been canceled. Claims 1, 2, 5, and 7-9 have been amended. No claims have been added. No new matter has been added. Claims 1, 2, 5, and 7 are the independent claims.

**Objection - Drawings**

In the Office Action dated August 21, 2006, the drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). FIG. 6 has been amended to include generation units, “Time Constant Changeover Circuit” and “Generation Circuit for AM.” Support for the amended drawing is found in the specification from page 22, line 22 through page 23, line 5. Withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

**Objection - Specification**

The specification stands objected to as allegedly having an non-descriptive title of the invention. The Examiner suggested the title, “Receiver having de-emphasis unit / low pass filer with cutoff frequency varying by resistances based on received signal strength” The title has been so amended. Withdrawal of the objection to the specification is respectfully requested.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph**

Claims 1 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite. The Examiner states that it is indefinite in claim 1 to have a receiver follow a demodulator. Claim 1 has been amended to recite a “receiver with a high-cut control de-emphasis circuit, the high-cut control de-emphasis circuit connected in the stage following a high frequency demodulator circuit.” Support for the amendment may be found in specification and drawings, for example at FIG. 1.

The Examiner also states that claim 9 failed to clearly differentiate the “control signal” and the “control signal for FM.” Claim 9 has been amended to recite a “first control signal” and a “third control signal.” Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is respectfully requested.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,995,817 (“Lubbe”). To anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim. MPEP § 2131. Claim 1 and claim 2 as amended recite “a high-cut control de-emphasis circuit.” Lubbe does not disclose such “a high-cut control de-emphasis circuit.” Lubbe discloses a low-pass filter (Col. 1, Lines 34-57), but the low-pass filter disclosed in Lubbe does not perform “both a high-cut control function and a de-emphasis function” as claimed.

Because Lubbe does not teach every element of claims 1 and 2, Lubbe cannot anticipate claims 1, 2, and the claims that depend from them. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is respectfully requested.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 5-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over the teachings of Lubbe in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,221,930 (“Okuno”). Three criteria must be met to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the prior art reference or references when combined must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. MPEP § 2143.

Claims 5 and 7 recite “a changeover unit for changing over the resistance value of the resistor.” Okuno teaches a circuit using two transistors with variable impedance. Okuno discloses, “[t]ransistors Q5 and Q6 are operated such that the impedance as measured between the main electrodes thereof is a function of the bias supplied to the respective gate electrodes. Thus, transistor Q5 forms the variable impedance element for the right channel and transistor Q6 forms the variable impedance element in the left channel.” (Col. 5, Lines 48-55). While the circuit in Okuno does contain resistors, the circuit in Okuno is changing the impedance value of the transistors not the resistance value of the resistors. Okuno does not disclose “a changeover unit for changing over the *resistance value of the resistors*” as claimed (emphasis added). There is no similar circuit disclosed in Lubbe either. Because the cited references do not teach all of the claim limitations, the rejection cannot stand.

**DOCKET NO.: TIC-0081**  
**Application No.: 10/519,753**  
**Office Action Dated: August 21, 2006**

**PATENT**

Withdrawal of the rejection to claim 5, 7, and the claims that depend from them under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application and an early Notice of Allowance for claims 1-9 are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 21, 2006



---

Michael A. Koptiw  
Registration No. 57,900

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor  
Philadelphia PA 19103  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439